



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,667	07/25/2003	Tadashi Kumamoto	1614.1349	1822
21171	7590	06/22/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			VU, HIEN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/626,667	KUMAMOTO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Hien D. Vu	2833		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 6 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-6 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

1. Claims 1-3 and 5 are objected to because in claims 1 & 5 it is unclear what is meant by "balanced cable".

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr, Jr. et al in view of Saka et al.

Insofar as the claims can be understood. Orr, fig. 2 shows a shielded cable connector with a balanced cable 20 extending from a connector cover 10, the cover having a first shielded half cover 12 and a second shield half cover 13 to be combined to each other. Orr does not show a cable guide having a pipe shape independent from the cover and having two cable half guides combinable with each other, and the cable guide having a pair of catching portions at a base part, the catch portions being engaged with respective recesses formed on mating surface of the wall portions of the first and second shield covers at opposite lateral sides of the cable exit hole in which engaging parts formed on the cable guide. Saka, figs. 1-2 show a pipe shape independent from a cover 10 and having a cable guide 30 having two cable half guides 36 combinable with each other, the cable guide having a pair of catching portion 37 at a base part of the catch portions and being engaged with recess 17 formed on mating surfaces of wall portions of a cover at opposite lateral sides of a cable exit hole 16A in which engaging parts 33 formed on the cable guide. It would have been obvious to one

with skill in the art to modify the connector of Orr by forming the cover with a cable guide having features as described above and the exist hole of the cover with recesses, as taught by Saka, in order to provide easier assembly.

As to claim 2, to form each of the cable half guides with a semicircular cross section would have been obvious of modifications since such change solves no stated problem.

As to claims 5 and 6, the claims have similar features as claim 1, therefore they are rejected under the similar rationale.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hein D. Vu at telephone number (571) 272-2016.

Vu/ds

06/04/05



HIEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER